

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed April 2, 2007, all pending claims 1-42 were rejected. Applicants above have amended claims 1, 15 and 29. Accordingly, claims 1-42 remain pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the amendments above and the following remarks.

Applicants also request that references cited in two information disclosure statements (IDS's) be considered. The first such IDS was filed August 9, 2007, (PTO-1449 enclosed), and the second IDS is being filed on even date.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102 and 103

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 15-17, 20-22, 29-31 and 34-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Cheyer (US 2003/0046201). Of these, claims 1, 15 and 29 are independent claims. The remaining dependent claims 4-5, 9-14, 18-19, 23-28, 32-33 and 37-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheyer in view of other references.

Without prejudice and in order to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended each of the pending independent claims 1, 15 and 29 to recite more particularly the subject matter sought to be protected. Applicants respectfully submit that each of the independent claims 1, 15 and 29 defines subject matter that is patentable over Cheyer, as do the dependent claims. Applicants distinguishing of Cheyer from the present claims should not be taken as an admission that Cheyer is properly considered prior art under any sub-section of 35 U.S.C. 102.

Cheyer relates to an electronic marketplace, either public or private, and more particularly relates to implementing an open services market platform in such a marketplace. (Para. 7.) In such electronic marketplaces, participants (that is, buyers, suppliers, and other appropriate entities) interact with one another via an electronic network. (See para. 4.) For example, Cheyer discloses that the open service market platform “implements private and public marketplaces by providing a network platform, preferably the Internet, for transactions designed for enterprise collaboration.” (Para. 25.)

Cheyer does not disclose or suggest the subject matter of claim 1. For example, Cheyer does not disclose or suggest, as recited in claim 1, a method of importing supplier information for use by a purchasing computing system, which method includes “establishing connection with an external service provider that includes a directory of suppliers and information relating to the suppliers,” “sending a request ... identifying a user-selected one of the suppliers included in the directory,” “receiving a response ... including information relating to the selected supplier,” and “parsing the information in the received response,” and “creating a new business partner entry for the selected supplier in a directory that is usable by the purchasing computing system.”

Cheyer's disclosure, in paragraph 38 referenced in the Office Action, of applications and services being published into an ontology-based service directory has no applicability to the claim 1 method. In particular, with such publications, there is no request that identifies a user-selected one of the suppliers included in a directory of an external service provider, and no receipt of a response including information relating to the selected supplier, as recited in claim 1. Further yet, with Cheyer's publication request there is no creation of a new business partner entry for the selected supplier in a directory that is usable by the purchasing computing system. Indeed, Cheyer's disclosure seems to have very little applicability to the claimed subject matter of claim 1, as amended.

Accordingly, Cheyer does not disclose or suggest the subject matter of claim 1. In addition, the references cited in connection with various dependent claims do not overcome the deficiencies of Cheyer vis-à-vis claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-14 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 15 is directed to an article, and independent claim 29 is directed to a system. Claims 15 and 29 are patentable over Cheyer and other cited references for the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1, as are dependent claims 16-28 and 30-42. As such, Applicants also request that the rejection of claims 15-42 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 1-42 are in condition for allowance. In addition, Applicants request that the references contained in two IDS's submitted by Applicants be considered.


It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 06-1050 \$1050 for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

Oct 2, 2007



Stephen R. Schaefer
Reg. No. 37,927

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696